

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Stanley Lee Moultrie,	)	C/A No. 9:14-cv-1690 DCN
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
Director William Byars, Jr.; South Carolina	)	
Department of Corrections Director; Bryan P.	)	
Stirling; Governor Nikki Haley; Attorney General	)	
Alan Wilson; Deputy Director Robert Ward; SCDC	)	
General Counsel Dayne Haile; Christopher Florian;	)	
Ann Hallman, Agency Grievance Coordinator;	)	
Maria Leggins, Agency Mailroom Coordinator;	)	
Willie Eagleton, Evan Warden; Associate Warden	)	
McFadden; Major C. West; Bethea Lt. Michael	)	
Toms; Ms. Baker, Mailroom Coordinator; Ms.	)	
Graves, ECI Grievance Coordinator; Pamela	)	
McDowell, Mailroom Supervisor; Lt. James Martin;	)	
Sgt. H. Sims; Associate Warden Bush, Lee CI;	)	
Associate Warden Nolan; Associate Warden Dean;	)	
K. Rivers, Lee CI Grievance Coordinator; Jimmy	)	
Sleigh; Deputy Warden; Lt. Jack Brown; Ms.	)	
Conyers, Lee CI Officer; General Counsel Tatarsky;	)	
Deputy Director McCall; Amy Smith; D. Eastridge;	)	
Felicia McQueen; Sandra Bowie; Deputy Warden	)	
Davis; Captain Mr. Thomas; and Ms. Wilson,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

The above referenced case is before this court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted, and this case be dismissed.

This court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend

for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. Thomas v Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984 ).<sup>1</sup> **Objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation were timely filed by plaintiff on August 3, 2015. Defendants timely filed their response to plaintiff's objections on August 4, 2015.**

A de novo review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation is **AFFIRMED**, defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**, and this case is **DISMISSED**.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**




---

David C. Norton  
United States District Judge

August 10, 2015  
Charleston, South Carolina

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure

---

<sup>1</sup>In Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985), the court held "that a pro se litigant must receive fair notification of the consequences of failure to object to a magistrate judge's report before such a procedural default will result in waiver of the right to appeal. The notice must be 'sufficiently understandable to one in appellant's circumstances fairly to appraise him of what is required.'" Id. at 846. Plaintiff was advised in a clear manner that his objections had to be filed within ten (10) days, and he received notice of the consequences at the appellate level of his failure to object to the magistrate judge's report.